



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
087655,491	05/18/96	KRAMER	R SAND-A

HUDAK & SHUNK CO  
SUITE 308  
7 WEST BOWERY STREET  
AKRON OH 44308-1133

IM41/0507

EXAMINER
SNAY, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1743	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/98

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/665,491**

Applicant(s)  
**Kramer**

Examiner  
**Jeffrey R. Snay**

Group Art Unit  
**1743**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffrey R. Snay

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Ronald A. Kramer, Applicant

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview 28 Apr 1998

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant explained his intent to introduce new language to the specification and claims which would disclose the effects of increasing the coefficient of friction of a used wiper blade. Applicant was advised any such language would be considered as to whether new issues would be raised or new matter introduced when filed. Applicant was further advised that some subject matter, when supported by clear evidence that such subject matter was well known in the art pertaining to the instant invention, and would have been envisaged by the skilled artisan upon reading the instant specification, could be brought into an application without constituting new matter, so long as the noted language is not essential to the patentability of the claimed invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

**JEFFREY R. SNAY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 1743**